

House of Commons Procedures

Mr. Prittie: It may be possible to get extra page boys or *Hansard* reporters, but on Monday of this week the Secretary of State made a statement to the House in reply to questions I and the hon. Member for Quebec East had asked concerning interpreters, and the fact of the matter is that there are really not enough to do the work in Parliament and in its committees, as well as other jobs outside of Parliament. Furthermore, such people are simply not available in the country at the present time and even if authority is granted to hire more it will be quite some time before they can be secured. I do not know how this staff is going to cope with the problem of the hours of sitting when the staff is already spread very thin at the present time.

The Chairman: Is the Committee ready for the question?

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few remarks about the proposed amendment of the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

For many days we have been discussing parliamentary procedure. It is needless to say that a reform of our parliamentary procedure is essential. However, I should say that our procedure and standing orders were not so bad, but when you make ill use of them, you are forced to amend the standing orders and to impose more severe restrictions. As some took an unfair advantage of our parliamentary procedure, we are forced to accept reforms.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the house are ready to agree to those reforms inasmuch as they are respectful of democracy and of the privileges of each member of this house.

No privilege of hon. members must be infringed upon and that is why we are ready to shorten the debate and even the time allocated for each speech. We are willing to accept reforms in several fields, as long as they respect democracy and the freedom of each member.

Hon. members should have the right to vote orally at any time. In ten or fifteen minutes, much can be said, provided that only the important and relevant matters are dealt with. We must not wander too far from the subject. In fact, we are ready to accept reforms under those conditions.

Mr. Chairman, if Canadian industries managed their business as we administer those of the state, many of them would be on

[Mr. McLraith.]

the verge of bankruptcy within 15 days, if not sooner, because we do nothing for the country. We waste the country's money and when we return to our ridings, people ask us what we are doing here—

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to interrupt to remind him that we are now considering paragraph 1 of Resolution No. 15. I would advise him to restrict his remarks to that part of the resolution.

Mr. Latulippe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again I revert to the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre on the question of sitting during meal hours.

As a businessman of the twentieth century I find that everything has been reformed, that our great reformers, our great economists are reforming everything throughout the country, except the standing orders of the House of Commons, which have practically not been changed since confederation.

With regard to the motion, I feel that we must take enough time to eat, as businessmen would do. We must adjourn our debates at mealtime to allow everyone to live like human beings. We must also give all employees of the house, as well as the restaurant employees, time to live because we are no longer in 1914 or 1887; we are in 1965, in a country which has known progress not only in the field of science but in all fields. We have accepted all kinds of changes in all fields and we must do as much in the house.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, hon. members' privileges must be preserved to the utmost; time allowed for debate can be shortened while giving every member the chance to express himself freely.

As far as the matter of a permanent Speaker is concerned, I fail to see what would be the use of changing the existing situation. We have our standing orders and the Speaker enforces them.

Personally, I have been satisfied with the successive Speakers we had since I have been a member of Parliament. I think that the Speakers have done their duty and I fail to see what purpose would be served by the appointment of a permanent Speaker.

We must take the Speakers as they are, we must select them from our membership and I believe that every Speaker considered it his duty to enforce standing orders. The Speakers who followed one another have enforced the rules and it is to the credit of the